

Remarks

Applicants have read and considered the Office Action dated March 27, 2003 and the references cited therein. New claims 26-47 have been added and the remaining claims have been cancelled. Reconsideration and reexamination are hereby requested.

In the Action, it is noted that there had been a numbering error in the claims as originally submitted and that claim 20 was inadvertently cancelled. New claims have been added and the confusion with regard to claim 20 is moot.

The disclosure was objected to because of an informality. The disclosure has now been amended to eliminate the confusing language. No new matter has been added.

The drawings were objected to because of typographical errors and incomplete nomenclature. Corrected drawings are enclosed herewith and are believed to overcome the objection to the drawings. No new matter has been added.

Claim 3 was objected to because of an informality. Claim 3 has now been cancelled and the new claims are believed to overcome any objections to the claims.

Claims 1, 3, 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Kisor et al.* Newly submitted claim 26 expresses a three-step indexing performed by an engine provider. This distinguishes between the operations that were carried out by a search engine provider and those performed by the user searching program. According to the present invention, a spider program is used by the engine provider to obtain information and then produce a huge map of essentially all web links pointing from web sites to other web sites. With such a map, the indexing continues by analyzing the map and dividing all of the sites into groups. A group is a collection of sites having many interconnecting links within the group, and considerably fewer links directing to sites out of the group. This may be illustrated by explanation on pages 16-18 of the application in reference to Figures 3 and 4. The indexing procedure of the present invention extracts groups by assuming that when there are many interconnecting links within a collection of sites, they form a group as there is a common

denominator between the group sites. The steps of using a spider program and analyzing the map of claim 26 that lead to the grouping (i.e., finding groups) of sites are performed automatically and are based on analyzing only links and their directions (i.e., target sites). Said grouping steps are characterized by the fact they ignore any site content. When the web has been divided into the groups at the end of the analyzing the map step of claim 26, there is still no knowledge of the specific subject being the common denominator of each group. The finding of the common denominator of each group is performed in the labeling step of claim 26, which is an indexing step based on content observation, and which assigns a name to each group. Applicants assert that this is neither shown nor suggested by *Kisor* or any of the other cited art. Applicants note that *Kisor* teaches indicating in the header of the web site (or web page) words that appear in the web site that are typical to the content of the site. Applicants direct the Examiner to column 3, lines 40-41 of *Kisor*, which states: "for example, A1, A2, A3 in the attribute list 212 may be 'Intel microprocessor, 64-bit'." In other words, *Kisor* indicates in the header the words that appear most frequently in the web site and *Kisor* teaches searching only within the header and fetching at a first stage only headers of web sites that contain in the header the words defined in the user's search criteria. *Kisor* does not teach or suggest a manner of indexing as recited in the steps of claim 26 discussed above. In addition, none of the other prior art cited by the Examiner teaches or suggests such a three step indexing.

The Examiner further asserts that *Kisor* teaches showing embedded graphics and tables. However, the graphics and table of *Kisor* are clearly indicated in column 1, lines 39-41 as being part of the web page not a visual, property related representative image that is formulated by the search engine provider. Moreover, in *Kisor* when the web site is found in the user's search, the formulated symbol is not displayed as being associated to the site as recited in new claim 27. Moreover, none of the prior art teaches or suggests such a method.

Claims 13, 14 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) and 102(e) as being anticipated by *Levin et al.* *Levin* neither teaches nor suggests three-step indexing as recited in claim 26. *Levin* suggests ranking the relevance of displayed sites according to the number of links and "mapping" the links to a specific location on the user's display. *Levin* fails to provide relation to the three-step indexing, including grouping and labeling as recited by the present

invention and performed by an engine provider. The "mapping" of *Levin* has a different meaning than the forming of the map according to the present invention. The Examiner is directed to column 3, lines 44-49, column 6, lines 46-52 and column 11, lines 5-10 for further explanation of the terms as used by *Levin*.

Claims 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) and 102(e) as being anticipated by *Jacobson et al.* Applicants assert that the indexing of *Jacobson*, as recited at column 3, lines 60-66 does not consider any links. The method recited by the present invention is neither shown nor suggested by *Jacobson* or any combination of the other cited references.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over *Kisor et al.* in view of *Krellenstein*. *Kisor* is discussed above and Applicants assert that the claims distinguish over *Kisor*. *Krellenstein* discusses clustering (see column 3, lines 11-16), but does not refer to links while clustering. Applicants assert that the present claims distinguish over *Kisor* and any combination with *Krellenstein*.

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kisor et al.* in view of *Brown et al.* Applicants agree with the Examiner that *Brown* refers to the number of hyperlinks as a factor for ranking. However, *Brown* fails to disclose a three-step indexing as recited in claim 26. Moreover, the combination of *Brown* with any of the other cited references would not lead to the present invention.

Claims 7-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over *Kisor et al.* in view of *Woods et al.* As discussed above, Applicants assert that *Kisor* neither teaches nor suggests the indexing method of the present invention. Moreover, *Woods* neither teaches nor suggests such a method and the combination does not arrive at the present invention. Applicants assert that the rejection over the combination of *Woods* and *Kisor* is traversed.

Claims 15-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over *Levin et al.* in view of *Woods et al.* As discussed above, the *Levin* and *Woods* references neither teach nor suggest the present invention. Applicants assert that the present invention is neither shown nor suggested by the combination of *Levin* and *Woods*.

Finally, claim 18 was rejected as being obvious over *Levin et al.* in view of *Kanaegami et al.* *Levin* neither teaches nor suggests the invention and modifying *Kanaegami et al.* as asserted by the Examiner would not arrive at the recited invention. Applicants assert that the rejection is traversed.

In addition, new claim 27 recites determining whether properties exist in a web site, such as whether the site is an academic site, allows for shopping or has a chat option. New claim 27 recites giving to each site a representative visual image reflecting these properties. This is neither shown nor suggested by any of the prior art references or combination thereof. The sites that meet the criteria are divided into groups each associated with its image. This is neither shown nor suggested by the prior art.

New claim 30 recites that sites found in the user's search are displayed in a hierarchal arrangement with units of continents-countries-cities-streets-buildings where the units are grouped as found in the indexing of claim 26. None of the prior art teaches or suggests such easily understood display or grouping. The present invention provides for improved indexing display of searching that is neither shown or suggested by any of the prior art or combination thereof. Applicants assert that the claims, as submitted, patentably distinguish over the prior art.

A speedy and favorable action on the merits is hereby solicited. If the Examiner feels that a telephone interview may be helpful in this matter, please contact Applicants' representative at (612) 336-4728.


Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

Dated: _____

6/01/04

By: _____


Gregory A. Sebald
Reg. No. 33,280
GAS/krm